

Kleeberg letter of January 7, 2003

Comment # 2

One of the old tricks is for a person to pretend openly to be a good guy as a cover for being a bad guy.

This is clearly demonstrated by the early English novel Jonathan Wild which was based upon real life. Due to excessive burglary losses in English homes Jonathan Wild helped victims recover stolen property and encouraged payment of rewards from them to him for recovery of the items. He acted as an independent go-between for the victims and the thieves. It satisfied the victims and produced a source of income for Wild. The burglars were pleased because they did not have to sell the goods they had stolen or risk arrest in dealing with fences.

For the help Wild was giving to victims he naturally would not disclose information about the burglar contacts he had.

Unfortunately for Wild it was soon determined that he was arranging for burglaries and aiding the burglars in their work so as to increase his reward income. His work came to an end on a rope.

Kleeberg letter of January 7

Comment # 3

It is stated in your draft that the \$20 USAOG pieces from the Franklin Arizona hoard were on cast planchets. The source mentioned for that information was Paul Garland (the deceased former owner of the piece and claimant under the PNG arbitration) and George Fuld (a numismatic researcher then active in asserting that the piece was a forgery but later helping to write the Clifford sale catalog as an employee of Bowers).

We were asked to help of Paul Garland in the arbitration hearings.

We have no recollections of such "cast planchet" assertions and do not think our files have any written records as to that. We would like to know what assertions there are particularly a copy of the Fuld letter to Amelingmeier dated September 30, 1964. We are not aware that a struck planchet of gold can be non-destructively determined to have been cast.

One of the \$20 USAOG hoard pieces of which we have a photograph in our files distinctly shows the tool marks of an automatic lathe on almost the entire field of one of the group of Franklin hoard coins. The tool marks are in the form of a helical cut (not concentric circles) with the light lines very close together. We asserted in our argument that a lathe with an automatically moving tool was not available in California in 1853. The opinion of an MIT instructor was submitted by the Ryan side (the defendant) that it

was in existence, having just been invented. This difference of opinion is in the arbitrators' records, I believe. A power turned lathe was advertised for sale in California at the time but that we think was for the power to turn the main spindle, not to advance or retract the die cutting tool uniformly by power.

All bonafide planchets start from a cast billet and are thinned between rollers by stages down to the desired thickness before the disc is cut out to produce a planchet. That is why the lathe tool marks are so condemning in the diagnosis of a piece first showing up in the 20th century.

The Arizona hoard USAOG pieces have 170 reeds. Kagin states (p. 331) that the USAOG pieces which vary in thickness and have a different design also have 170 reeds. This seems to indicate that all 170 reed pieces are from the same source. We pointed out the 170 reed situation at the PNG hearings.

cmt 3, p2

Kleeberg letter of January 7, 2003

Comment # 6

Please observe that in the Clifford pamphlet published in 1961 that there is a star under 19 California pieces and 2 Colorado pieces. This star is explained in the "Note Regarding the Illustrations". The pieces without the star were then a part of Clifford's collection which he had assembled in California over a period of many years prior to the publication. None are suspect.

The illustrations with the star under them were not then in the Clifford collection and include only items which were newly known and which are suspect. Of this group designated with the star some may already have gone to Lilly or Murrell and a decision had not been made as to which ones were to be sold to Lilly, Murrell, Clifford or others. The source of the pictures of pieces with the star is very important because all are from the same source. This makes the date of the pamphlet of major importance. Clifford seems to have acquired some of these starred pieces later as his sale was not until 1982. In the pamphlet a starred pattern or trial piece not in gold but starred may have originated with Nagy. All of this makes the date of the Clifford pamphlet a major piece of evidence and the source of the starred material very important.

Kleeberg letter of January 7, 2003

Comment # 4

In the Donald Kagin book on Private Gold Coins (page ix) the name of Coe Ann Franklin is acknowledged as a researcher. Do you know who that is?

Kleeberg letter of January 7, 2003

Comment # 5

Agrell (Agnell) was said by Clifford to have died in 1855. This was copied by Kagin. Dan Owens found him alive and well many years later.

The true proof of plagiarism is copying a mistake made by the original writer. The copying of Adams before the error was corrected much later is proof of forgery.

May 2, 2003 partial draft of letter
to John Kleeberg

2/6/2

As to the #5 Scholtz ~~over~~ 8 real Mexico, was in the hands of Kosoff ~~just before~~ the Arizona Board trial occurred. ~~I suggested that~~ and ~~a~~ to play a joke on Kosoff. ~~I thought that~~ ~~that~~ it was borrowed and a fake copy made and returned to Kosoff who didn't know the difference. Then they had a laugh and gave ~~Kosoff~~ ^{back to} the original piece. This would obviously be a Massapequa ~~stunt~~ and not a Nazi product. It was just that simple. You probably will agree.

It may ~~interest~~ interest you to know ~~my~~ ^{current} term ~~on the~~ Council of ANS expires this fall and I ~~will not stand~~ ^{have chosen} ~~not~~ to stand for reelection. The bylaws to be adopted limit the length of term and I have been a councillor for decades. ~~Although~~ the term limit ~~is~~ is a grandfather clause as to me I am accepting it as though it applied. I am retaining my position ^{in guiding the} class cent recovery program.

I just returned from Cuba and was there when the dissidents were put in jail and the hijackers eliminated. It was a fascinating experience.

This amazing to me that you are graduating as a LHO already and congratulations for ~~being~~ being the first person who went into the law because of ^{gain} experience.

My best,

You sent a portion of the debt inventory of the Newsmen Pioneer Board and I would appreciate a full copy of it.

963

Mr. John Kleeberg
430 E. 56th St., Apt. 8F
New York, NY 10022

June 26, 2003

Dear John:

Your letter of June 3, 2003 was a delight to receive and it is so full of important observations and comments that my reply needs extra thinking. It is great to have such complex challenges. They are not new to either of us.

I refer to your paragraph numbers in this response. As to (1): Why do you believe Nagy had no obverse die of the 1853 USAOG \$20? Kagin shows on p. 328, No.12 and p.329, No. 15 the use of such a die. (perhaps also a slight modification on p. 329, No. 14). I still feel that Nagy had several obverse and reverse dies of the 1853 USAOG \$20. There could have been a matrix for any of the dies in Nagy's possession as indicated by comments in Clifford Sale item #48 as you point out, but why does that exclude any dies being on hand also. Perhaps my copper piece may modify your thinking.

As to (2): I will enclose or separately send an 1853 copper \$20 USAOG bought as a Nagy piece. We also have another one. They were bought from an Early American History Auction and there were four offered at the time. Please return the coin in due course.

As to (3): concerning the Templeton Reid the following comment may be helpful. Even if Reid never left Georgia he could have sent or arranged for a representative in California who had the dies whether the dies were made in Georgia or California. How could Nagy obtain the dies if they did not come from California to Philadelphia. There was no reason why the dies would move between Georgia and Philadelphia. All the lettering and numbering on the original Reid dies and the dies you surmise were made by Nagy are made with the same set of punches so Nagy could not make a new set of dies without the punches. There could have been a second set of dies sent from California. The horizontal and angular serif difference could have been caused by a punch breaking after the original pair of dies were made. I agree partial punches would be impractical but a break in a punch could cause a small graver or tool to be used to correct a letter on a die.

As to (4): Peter Gaspar is satisfied that there is often no reliable non-destructive test to determine whether a cast piece or a piece struck on a cast planchet can be clearly distinguished from a struck piece on a planchet struck from. All rolled planchets start with a cast billet. The metal in all planchets flow in the course of striking as you well know.

As to (5): Gaspar and I agree that the Wolfgang -Fischer-Bossert position may not be reliable because usually only metallic trace elements are determined and if there

was a particle of clay dust or similar compound the aluminum would show up because the test was made recently and long after the 1886 discovery of how to produce pure aluminum from alumina by electricity.

As to (6): I have never seen the St. Patrick uncirculated pure copper pieces alleged to exist. If they are from the same dies as the silver piece I wrote about and the gold piece ANS has and the BM has then I believe Franklin did the work. The silver piece showed up in Europe at the time the Franklin work was also showing up in Europe. You were going to check the ANS gold piece and find out the source and date of the BM piece.

As to (7) I agree that the \$5 Conway overstrike must be a Massapequa job. Do you agree that the letter punches differ from the genuine Conway pieces? If so Franklin decided not to make the very difficult numeral 5 and left it off of the die he was making. Apparently he was able to make the letter punches more or less similar to those used to make the dies for the other genuine coins. Do you have a copy of the letter in which Ford said he got the new Conway die as a gift?

As to (9): I can tell you **only as to what I have heard

As to (10) I have found no mention of \$20 Parsons bar in any literature prior to 1954 in which it says that it was discovered in 1952 and "authenticated" in 1953. I have sent Evans all of this data showing the conflicting comments made by Franklin's friend, being **

In the Legacy article Ford "bought" it. In the Cohen letter Ford "discovered" it. In the Standard catalogue Ford "authenticated" it. In the letter to ANACS Ford "just handled" it. How is that for consistency.

As to PPS (2 In Pioneer Gold Coinage of the West by A. Kossoff in 1964 (copyright 1964, Sol Kaplan) there are many references to "our collection" etc. (pp. 4,5,11,12,13,14 etc). on p.24 "The scope of our efforts was confined to the gold coins in the Painter Collection and the specific Pattern and Trial Pieces which were available." Painter himself is mentioned on p.11, 19 and 24. I presume from this that Kosoff sold the Painter Collection at that time. The pieces illustrated were primarily those of Painter, I must conclude.

I communicated with Painter and he was reluctant to say very much about the source of his pieces or give data about them. I believe he was glad to get out of the situation.

As to PPS (3) The Nagy source for the \$50 Union was new to me. That is a great find.

Evelyn joins me in wishing you a great legal career. Why is it that the ethics of 97% of attorneys vary from the high standards of the legal profession.

Keep the pot boiling,

Eric P. Newman

Mr. John Kleeberg
430 E. 56th St.
New York City, NY 10022

June 2, 2004

Dear John:

In the Stack's catalog of the Ford Collection the June 23, 2004 Part IV contains encased postage stamp lots 332, 637, 638, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646 and 647. *some unusual*
Almost all are All but a couple are unique. There are two known of the non-unique. Most have never been publicly described before. Some contain revenue stamps, letter envelope stamps, etc. No existence prior to ~~circa~~ 1958 is known for any. Some have blank backs. Two have bank note style inserts in the back which is cut out and covered by mica. Several first appeared in a 1968 auction. Some are also illustrated in color. Most are the last items in the sale. On page 87 it states that some pieces are described as "collector pieces rather than real patterns or trial pieces". The script on page 181 says the are "custom jobs". Have you noticed these as we thought you might be interested.

Our best,

Eric P. Newman

the 1950's
which are not unique

double space

like the front

Return Flight

Flight number change

Melody McBeth

2893

in 4

Mr. John Kleeberg
430 E. 56th St.
New York City, NY 10022

June 2, 2004

Dear John:

In the Stack's catalog of the Ford Collection the June 23, 2004 Part IV contains some unusual encased postage stamp lots 332, 637, 638, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646 and 647. Almost all are unique. There are two known which are not unique. Most have never been publicly described before. Some contain revenue stamps, letter envelope stamps, etc. No existence prior to the 1950s is known for any. Some have blank backs. Two have bank note style inserts in the back which is cut out and covered by mica like the front. Several first appeared in a 1968 auction. Some are also illustrated in color. Most are the last items in the sale. On page 87 it states that some pieces are described as "collector pieces rather than real patterns or trial pieces". The script on page 181 says the are "custom jobs". Have you noticed these as we thought you might be interested.

Our best,

Eric P. Newman

[fragment]

Mr. John M. Kleeberg
430 E. 56th St. Apt. 8F
New York City, NY 10022

July 6, 2004

Dear John:

Congratulations on obtaining the Smithsonian copies of the enclosures you sent us on June 27, 2004. There is a great amount of reinforcement in them and a great amount of omission.

We cannot answer these matters at one time and will have to do it at intervals.

You asked specifically whether it was the Nagy material involved in 1959. The
✓ answer is yes. The January 6, 1959 letter of Ford to Steffanelli related to a proposed
purchase from the ^{Nagy} estate by one or more persons (including me) and a gift of ^{the items} it to the
Smithsonian because the contents were obviously lifted from the U.S. agencies. The idea
was to buy it at one price and in due course have it appraised at a much higher price
giving the donors a nice tax deduction to cover some or all of their cost. I refused to
participate. I also was skeptical about the deal because I felt some items might wander
off. This deal by rumor I was told did occur on some basis and was sealed for 50 years by
gift conditions so no one could be accused of dealing in lifted government property etc.

There was an inventory prepared by Steffanelli and apparently it is being withheld from
you by the restrictions you mention. Will Freedom of Information rights help you?

As you know, Kathy Bullowa was a friend and married Earl Moore
who was Nagy's nephew. Lives long, I

Thank you for extending my longevity. If I would have known I would have
consulted a doctor.

99.46
74.60
139.10
100.30
15.30

/331-6587

Tom
Simmons

Kers
Balsman
sharon-

~~5448~~

935-5480

Newcar insider

1890

Lawrence Gipson

DA 500

~~55~~

952

Conn taxider
1750-1775

F91.

c8

10

\$4.43

16436

6.88